

June 12, 2002

**PROPOSED CONFERENCE CALL AGENDA  
UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (UST) CLEANUP AND RESOURCE  
CONSERVATION AND RECOVERY ACT (RCRA) SUBTITLE C PROGRAM  
BENEFITS, COSTS AND IMPACTS REVIEW PANEL  
EPA SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY HEADQUARTERS  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Room Ariel Rios North 6013  
Tuesday, June 18, 2002  
2:00 p.m. - 4:00 p.m. Eastern Time**

**NOTE:** The purpose of this public teleconference meeting, as stated in the Federal Register of April 22, 2002 (Volume 67, Number 77, pages 19572 - 19575) is to provide an opportunity for the Panel to reach closure on a consensus draft advisory in a public forum. The teleconference is being convened to address issues that require further discussion from the face-to-face public meeting held on Monday, May 20 and Tuesday, May 21, 2002.

**I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND WELCOME:**

2:00 p.m. - 2:10 p.m.

- a. Welcome and Introduction of UST/RCRA BCI Panel Members(M), Consultants(C) and Guests Dr. A. Myrick (Rick) Freeman, Chair, UST/RCRA BCI Panel
- b. Introduction of Participants and Disclosure of Members and- Consultants Interest in Topic SAB & Participants
- c. Introduction to SAB Procedures and Logistics of the Review Dr. K. Jack Kooyoomjian, SAB Staff
- d. Administrative Items Dr. Jack Kooyoomjian

**II. OVERVIEW OF THE MAJOR POINTS RAISED IN THE DRAFT ADVISORY TO THE AGENCY**

Dr. Freeman, Chair, UST/RCRA BCI Panel

2:10 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.

- a. Overview of Major Points
- b. Open Discussion by Panel

**III. OPEN DISCUSSION OF DRAFT ADVISORY RESPONSE TO THE CHARGE QUESTIONS AND SUGGESTED REFINEMENTS TO CURRENT DRAFT:**

2:30 p.m. - 3:15 p.m.

- a. Open Discussion Dr. Freeman and UST/RCRA BCI Panel

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

Interested Public

3:15 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.

**V. OPEN DISCUSSION FOLLOWING PUBLIC COMMENTS:**  
3:30 p.m. - 3:55 pm

UST/RCRA  
BCI Panel M/C

**VI. CLOSING COMMENTS:**  
3:55 p.m. - 4:00 p.m.

Dr. Freeman, Chair  
UST/RCRA BCI Panel

**ADJOURN** 4:00 p.m.

**The Charge:** The Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response (OSWER) is requesting that the EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) review the following documents: “*Approaches to Assessing the Benefits, Costs, and Impacts of the RCRA Subtitle C Program*” and “*Approaches to Assessing the Benefits, Costs, and Impacts of the Office of Underground Storage Tanks Cleanup Program*.” The Charge to the SAB is:

- I. *Does the “OSWER Attributes Matrix” (Exhibit 1-1 in both reports) provide a good list of program attributes that could appropriately be used to describe OSWER program benefits, costs, impacts, and other key factors influencing program performance? Does the list provide a reasonable starting point for an analysis of an OSWER program that would ensure consideration of a broad range of program impacts and features? Should any attributes be modified, or deleted or added to this list, and if so, why?*
- II. *Keeping in mind that it was OSWER’s intention to evaluate a range of methodological options, and to include some relatively less resource-intensive options (recognizing these are likely to be less technically rigorous), are the methods presented viable and technically sound? Will the methods lead to defensible conclusions? Are the assumptions associated with the methods reasonable? If you believe any of these methods or assumptions are not viable, sound, or defensible, why not? Are the methods consistent with EPA’s Guidelines for Economic Analyses, to the extent the guidelines address the OSWER program attributes?*
- III. *Are the methods clearly and adequately described, for purposes of making a decision to select preferred methods for additional development and implementation? Are the advantages, disadvantages, and data requirements associated with each option clearly and adequately described? Is additional information needed for any of these methods in order for OSWER management to make an informed decision? If so, what information?*
- IV. *Are there alternative methods (or modifications of methods presented in the reports) that could be used to better characterize any of the attributes addressed in the two reports, keeping potential resource limitations in mind? If so, why? We are particularly interested in seeking SAB advice on methodologies to characterize the more traditional human health/environmental benefits (which represent EPA’s core areas of responsibility), but OSWER would also welcome any recommendations the SAB might have on better ways to characterize and/or quantify some of the more “non-traditional” attributes. These include sustainability and other long-term program impacts; the value of regulatory requirements that focus on providing information to the public; and the influence on program performance of factors such as stakeholder concerns and statutory/legal constraints.*

The charge listed above can also be found on the Science Advisory Board website at <http://www.epa.gov/sab/ustcharge.pdf>.